



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/671,657	09/27/2000	Neal A. Osborn	PALM-3306.US.P	5956

7590 05/02/2003

Wagner Murabito & Hao LLP
Two North Market Street Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

MYERS, PAUL R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2189

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2003

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/671,657	Applicant(s) OSBORN, NEAL A.	
	Examiner Paul R. Myers	Art Unit 2189	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 7-8, 10, 13-14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janky et al PN 6,496,874 in view of Gaston et al PN 6,546,297.

In regards to claims 1, 7-8, 10, 14 and 16: Janky et al teaches connecting a palmtop computer (PDA) with a memory expansion module (via port 926) and coupling a sled device (cradle) to the palmtop computer. Janky et al does not teach the sled device also connecting to the memory module. Gaston et al teaches directly connecting a first device (120) to a sled device (110). Connecting a memory module (115) to the sled device (110). And connecting the first device (120) to the memory module (115). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to directly connect Janky et al's sled device to Janky et al's memory module because this would have allowed for freeing the PDA from having to handle data transfers to and from the memory module from and to the cradle.

In regards to claims 13 and 19: Official notice is taken that circuit board edge connectors and bullet style connectors are common. It would have been obvious to use either type of connector as a matter of design choice because they are standards.

Art Unit: 2189

3. Claims 2-4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janky et al PN 6,496,874 in view of Gaston et al PN 6,546,297 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of applicants admitted prior art.

In regards to claims 2-4, 9 and 15: Janky et al and Gaston et al both teach memory modules. Neither Janky et al nor Gaston et al teach what type of memory modules are used. Applicants admits the SD Card, SmartMedia and Memory Stick memory modules are prior trademarked memory modules. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use any of these Memory modules because they are common modules.

4. Claims 5-6 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Janky et al PN 6,496,874 in view of Gaston et al PN 6,546,297 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Sorek et al PN 2001/0034803.

In regards to claims 5-6, 11-12 and 17-18: Janky et al's sled device is a GPS not a music player. Sorek et al teaches a large number of types of sled devices such as GPS's, minidisks and MP3 players. It would have been obvious to have the cradle be an MP3 player because this is a standard type of selling expansion.

In regards to claim 20: Janky et al teaches the interface being PCMCIA. Official notice is taken that USB, Ethernet, Serial and SCSI interfaces are common well known interfaces. It would have been obvious to use and to these interfaces as a matter of design choice because they are common used interfaces.

Art Unit: 2189

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul R. Myers whose telephone number is 703 305 9656. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 6:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Rinehart can be reached on 703 305 4815. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 746 7239 for regular communications and 703 746 7239 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305 3900.



PRM
May 1, 2003

PAUL R. MYERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER